

DATE

**GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING & CONSUMER PROTECTION  
COMMITTEE**

**OF THE**

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Government Operations, Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 28, 2014.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Leg. Robert Calarco, Chairman  
Leg. William J. Lindsay, III, Vice Chair  
Leg. Jay Schneiderman, Deputy Presiding Officer  
Leg. Thomas Cilmi  
Leg. Kara Hahn  
Leg. Kevin J. McCaffrey

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory  
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature  
Lora Gellerstein, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office  
Jill Moss, BRO  
Joe Muncey, BRO  
Benny Pernice, BRO  
Robert Doering, BRO  
Samuel Chu, Commissioner/Department of Labor & Consumer Affairs  
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office  
Bill Shilling, Aide to Legislator Calarco  
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory  
Gail Lolis, Deputy County Attorney/County Attorney's Office  
Chris DeLuca, Aide to Legislator Cilmi  
Charles Gardiner, Director of Government Affairs National Electrical Contractors Association  
Laurie Rudek  
Barbara Dennihy  
Lillian Lennon, RSVP Inc. Animal Welfare Rescue  
Kevin Casey, IBEW 25  
And all other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Flesher, Court Reporter

**MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

***(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:10 AM)***

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Good morning. Welcome to the Government Operations, Personnel, Consumer Affairs and Housing Committee. We're going to get started. If we could have all the Legislators to the horseshoe and rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Cilmi.

***(SALUTATION)***

Okay. Thank you and good morning. We're going to get into our agenda here. We have three cards for speakers. The first one is Laurie Rudek. Laurie, if you'd like to come forward, please. You just have to push the button.

**MS. RUDEK:**

Okay, thank you. Good morning. My name is Laurie Rudek. And I had the honor of speaking before you in April on this matter. I walked in that day pretty knowledgeable about puppy mills and the current role our pet stores play in this.

I was shocked that day to learn that dogs who are no longer performing as needed are sold to worse mills and even laboratories. I figured they were euthanized at about three years old. No. This hell goes on and on for them. Man's best friend? No. Clearly death is their only friend and the sooner the better.

The testimonies that day were quite sobering and showed us all the different terrible ways this affects families as well as the dogs. Even surgeons stepped forward in their scrubs to tell us their findings. Realizing the role our pet stores have in this is like waking up one morning to find out that you are financially funding the Holocaust. We can no longer allow this to continue. Right now all our shelters function above capacity. They are completely overburdened. Brookhaven Animal Shelter just put a plea out for people to please come help them feed kittens. If we change our current practice we financially help our County and what is a burden to our shelters becomes lucrative to our pet stores.

As we move forward, and I'm so hopeful that we will, yes, we are paving the way here in New York. But as I stated in April, we have 40 other cities who have made this their practice. We can reach out to them with any questions and concerns. Are they using trained volunteers for inspectors? Etcetera. If I still haven't convinced you that rescue groups and shelters can partner with pet shops, here is one last bit of info: With a thousand huge stores across America, Petco is the most successful pet store probably in the world. Petco only takes animals from rescue groups and never has and never will buy them from mills. This absolutely is possible. We can do this. Please, please vote this bill in and be proud as I am to be a part of it. Thank you so much.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you, Laurie. Our next speaker is Lillian Lennon.

**MS. LENNON:**

Good morning. My name is Lillian Lennon, and I'm a retired high school teacher from William Floyd School District, a volunteer for RSVP Animal Welfare and Rescue. I reside in East Moriches.

I am here again to support IR 1047 introduced by Legislator Schneiderman. It is imperative that we develop the protocol necessary to assure the welfare and safety of the animals and the care of the pet industry throughout Suffolk County. More important, which by the way, cannot be emphasized enough, there needs to be complete transparent disclosure as to exactly where the puppies and kittens originate so as to assure that the same industry is not patronizing puppy mill distributors notorious for their inadequate, deplorable conditions in which they continue to breed animals with little, if any, regard to the care of the mothers or the offspring.

Ironically, since reputable breeders would never sell their puppies or kittens to a pet store, it is conceivable that the source of the majority of these animals do originate from such facilities. Just connect the dots and you will find the source. That being said, it does not matter -- does not matter how well the animals are being taken care of currently at the pet store or whether the aesthetics and the cleanliness of the pet store meet standards well above what is currently regulated. No one is arguing this point. We would like to know where their "products", I put that in quotes, come from because as far as we're concerned that is exactly how these animals are viewed as products to support the livelihood of the pet store proprietor.

As my colleague just said a few minutes ago, with the millions of animals euthanized in shelters, homeless strays and animals awaiting a forever home through the many rescue groups throughout the country, it makes little sense for consumers to choose a pet store over a reputable breeder, a shelter or a rescue organization. This industry has had its heyday. Time to join the rest us in creating a more humane country, county that pioneers a more compassionate approach by providing the animals that are already here a home to live out their life in peace. Although spay/neuter campaigns are making a huge difference in reducing the magnitude of unwanted litters in this country, we still have plenty of puppies and kittens for the consumer to adopt without the need to patronize a pet store. Please pass IR 1047. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you. Our next speaker is Kevin Casey.

**MR. CASEY:**

Good morning Members of the Legislature. My name Kevin Casey. I'm with IBW Local 25, the Electricians Local here in Nassau and Suffolk County. I'm speaking on behalf of resolution IR 1425. I'm speaking on behalf of my business manager, Kevin Harvey, who sits on the Electrical Licensing Board of Suffolk County and just want to say that Local 25 is in full support of expanding the Electrical Licensing Board. Thank you, have a great day.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Thank you very much, Kevin.

Okay. I have no other cards. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to address the Committee? Anybody else? Okay. Seeing none, we're going to move onto the agenda. Okay. Let's get into the agenda here. We're going to start with our tabled resolutions.

***TABLED RESOLUTIONS***

**IR 1047 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to regulate pet dealers and pet stores in the County of Suffolk. (Schneiderman)**

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

A motion by Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion, if I can.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I just wanted to compliment Legislator Schneiderman and his staff, wherever they are, on working so hard at developing consensus on this. Obviously a very emotional topic and there are obviously very strong opinions, you know, to the far extremes on both sides of the issue. But it seems, based on the communication that I've received from folks across that spectrum, that the result that -- that you've been able to come to is fair and I think will help the situation, so --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Good on you.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's often unsung heroes; there's a few in this case. Sarah from -- Sarah Simpson -- Simpson from George's office really worked very hard. Went to all these meetings and tried to figure out how to put it all into this bill. And, I think, did a really phenomenal job, did a lot of research on this to see what we could and what we couldn't do and came up with some very, I thought, clever solutions. I'm sure she worked with George on it, too. But also the advocates who have been tireless, coming to the meetings. And even the pet stores, never thought we'd have a bill that both the animal advocates and the pet stores could live with. And we actually have support from both sides here. So this is a good thing. I appreciate all that and I look forward to it moving to the floor. And then you guys won't have to listen to every meeting these 50 to 100 speakers talking about puppy mills. All right. Thank you.

**LEG. CILMI:**

There's already something else around the corner.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

What we would do with our free time?

**(LAUGHTER)**

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. I have a motion and a second. Any other -- anything else on the motion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1047 is approved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-1 P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE - LEG. HAHN NOT PRESENT)**

**(APPLAUSE)**

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm sure that the people here who are here in support of the bill know this, but it now goes to the floor next Tuesday. And that's when the main vote will be. And then assuming it passes, will go to the Executive; County Executive's desk.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Moving on. **IR 1300 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to eliminate automatic pay increases for County Elected Officials. (Lindsay)**

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second. Wait. Withdraw my second; withdraw the second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, I have no second. Is there any other motions?

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

If I could speak on the motion?

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Sure, Legislator Lindsay.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

We just -- if you haven't seen it yet, BRO just put out the numbers for this. I'm sorry, it's the wrong, that's the -- I'm on the wrong bill there.

But in regards to the automatic pay increases with the bill, we -- you know, I understand that the -- the position as it was originally intended by the County Charter was supposed to be a part-time position. And I know a lot of us, myself included, put a lot of hours into what we do and not only in our Legislative -- in the Legislative process but serving our constituents and all the different events and weekends and evening hours, I just, my opinion we're out of parity with other jurisdictions and not by a small amount, but by a significant amount. And when you also factor in that the other elected officials are quickly approaching the \$200,000 a year mark, I just think in light of the fiscal situation that we're currently facing, we're in the middle of the budget process, we see how difficult that is, we -- we've cut in so many other places I think it's time that we look at ourselves as well as the other elected officials and in my opinion it's the right thing to do and was hoping for some support; but absent of any, I understand everybody's position and respect that.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I mean, you know, as a term-limited Legislator, it's probably best to leave it to those Legislators who are going to be here in terms of what the -- their salaries will be. I'm unaffected by this bill. But I will say that keeping the salary, adjusting it for the cost-of-living inflation just kind of keeps it with the same purchasing power it had at the start. And, you know, often these things are characterized as raises when they're basically just keeping it in pace with CPI. So once you stop doing that, you effectively are going to be lowering the salary every year. And I think you're going to see less-qualified people in these offices.

So I think it's important to have, you know, the right salary in place. And I'm not going to second just simply because it's not going to affect me. I think that somebody who it will affect should second it.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Thank you. If I could respond to that through the Chair.

***(\*Legislator Hahn has entered the meeting\*)***

I understand and I agree. I think if you look at the private sector and what they've gone through over the last six years, their buying power has been reduced in that time period. And I just think in light of our financial situation, it's not something we should do; I think it's something we have to do. The savings would be significant. And I think it sends a strong message to our constituents that we're trying to do everything we can to get our budget situation under control.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. So I have a motion. I do not have a second and I do not have any other motions. So the issue fails for lack of a second. **(FAILS for LACK of a SECOND)** Moving on.

**IR 1409 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to establish the Suffolk County Taxi and Limousine Commission and to provide for the registration of for-hire vehicles.**

**(Co. Exec.)** I'll make a motion to approve. I see Mr. Vaughn standing at the podium. Yes, Mr. Vaughn.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually at this point in time, we would like to table the bill for one cycle. We are going to be laying on the table on the third a, pardon me, a capital project to take care of the technological component that is going to be necessary to help us run this agency. And we'd like to do the two of those items together at the -- during the next cycle.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Very well. Okay. Then I will withdraw my motion. I'll make a motion to table; second by Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

On the motion, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just very quickly. During, I believe, it was a presentation from Paul Margiotta on this issue, one of the questions that came up for me was this issue of prohibiting those who are in arrears with their child support payments from receiving a license. And I had asked at that time if that could be clarified because we certainly don't want to prevent people from working who are attempting to pay their child support. I don't -- I see the language in the bill is still relatively, you know, concise and plain and doesn't go into any detail about making exceptions in certain cases. I'm wondering if you'd just comment on that.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Sure. So, two points of clarification: one, it is not a State requirement, but it is consistent with all -- as for the code 498 it is a -- consistent with our other licensing requirements. I have myself become more familiar with the process since that -- since that committee meeting. We do deny people if they come up as arrears in the system, at which point we refer them to Social Services. And they have the opportunity to make a payment plan. This is a one or two-day process. Once they have established a payment plan with DSS, we get notification and we do issue licenses.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But in that case the language of the bill should be changed so that it reflects that. Because right now it says: *no applicant shall be in arrears for child support payments*. It's very plain. So there needs to be, from a legal perspective, I would think, there needs to be some clarification there.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

I would defer to, you know, the attorneys on that.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Hi, Gail. Gail Lolis is here; perhaps she could clarify.

**MS. LOLIS:**

I have to find specifically where it is in the bill but the bill does say as long as they are under a

payment plan with CSEB that's -- they would not be in arrears.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Great, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Thank you. Legislator -- is that it, Legislator Cilmi, are you done?

**LEG. CILMI:**

That was it.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

So, just to clarify, it could be revoked if they stopped the payment plan.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

That is not correct. That is actually a discussion we've had that this -- this specific conversation was the impetus for us revisiting. We can only have right now -- statutorily, we only have the ability to deny either issuance of a license or renewal. It's something that we -- we think it is a loophole. We think that there should be a mechanism, it would make sense, and I think it would be in the intent of the initial regulation to allow us to revoke on grounds of discontinuing their agreed-upon payments, but I'd leave that, you know, to the Legislature.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Is the renewal annual?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

In some cases; in some case biannual. This particular one will be an annual renewal.

**LEG. HAHN:**

And -- but the ability to revoke for that reason is State-granted; it's a loophole in the State law?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

No, this is -- this is -- falls within the jurisdiction of this County Legislature and County Executive to pass such a resolution. You're granting the department powers to revoke based upon noncompliance with their child support payments; their agreed-upon payment plan. But right now we only have the ability to deny upon issuance or renewal.

**LEG. HAHN:**

When you say "right now" you mean, what, under --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

As the current law stands. And this law is written in the same fashion.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Can we write this law -- I mean, you're asking us to table it. Can you add that ability to revoke for that reason?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

You know, I would -- I mean, as an administrator my preference would be if that's the -- if that's the will of the body, I would rather submit a later amendment that would allow that for all of our licenses. So the policy's consistent amongst all of our licensing jurisdictions.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

If I may just add into that, I believe that the way this whole system works with child support is that while we may not necessarily technically have the ability to revoke those licenses, should the courts, through the Family Courts, find that a person is willfully violating their child support payments, they can -- they can take action to force the person's license to be revoked whether it be their driver's license or their occupational licensing.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, but I think having gone through the child support system and going to court, I think that putting the onus on the parent who's supposed to be receiving the payments is a little -- you know, I think that -- that fixing it on our side would act as a, you know, a stick and a deterrent to not paying knowing that you can lose your license.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

My suggestion would be, if this is of interest to Legislator Hahn, I'd be glad to get together with you, go over it with you in detail, and you know, work with you.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, but I don't know why we would pass something that has a broken piece to it knowingly -- knowingly has a loophole of this nature. Even though we're going to fix the rest of them, why would we agree to pass something with this kind of problem knowing -- you know, knowing that this exists.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

I don't know if that constitutes substantial alteration in the legislation. That would be for the attorneys to figure out, which would initiate us having to go through the entire public hearing process again.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Is it very specific to this?

**LEG. CILMI:**

(Inaudible)

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, go ahead, Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So I don't know that we need to -- so to Legislator Hahn, I think we can probably get this other part done quickly enough where it would address this as well as all the other -- I think Sammy is, the Commissioner is right in wanting to have a policy that pervades all of our licensing issues. And I would suggest that the ability to revoke is broader in nature and extends to any violation of, you know, the criteria that's included in our licensing requirements. So that if one of the criteria, for example, is that, you know, somebody is -- passes a drug test and all of a sudden that person gets convicted of a drug offense or something or whatever, we should have the ability to revoke the license in that case, too; or a drunk driving offense or anything like that.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

If it's the, you know, the will of the Legislature, I -- you know, I'll make it a priority to work on something with Legislator Hahn to maybe achieve some degree of simultaneity between the two -- the two bills to reflect the, you know, if that proves to be the consensus of the Legislature.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So if we -- if we wrote and passed a law that allowed revocation of licenses when the criteria for issuing those licenses has been in some way violated during the term of somebody's licensure,



would that be -- would that be acceptable to you?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

You know, we're -- you know, we're in a position where anything we can do to strengthen our -- our ability to enforce our licensing standards and trade standards, you know, we're in favor of.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So that sounds reasonable?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Yeah, of course.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I would ask Counsel just to draft --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

I mean, if we deny an initial licensure or renewal upon those grounds, I don't see why we would want -- you know, the intent is to not have someone be licensed under those conditions, So.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So I would just ask Counsel to draft a proposal like that. And you have to allow obviously for some sort of a fair hearing process.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

That could be written into the legislation as desired.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right, exactly. And we'll take that up in short order. Thanks.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Legislator Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I just have a question about the arrears. Is there a certain level? Is it -- you know, because, you know, someone may be \$50 in arrears. That's different than someone being \$10,000 in arrears. At what level is it triggered?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Again, our agency has a certain expertise. We rely upon, you know, Social Services to do, you know, their part. So the Legislature doesn't specifically spell out, you know, levels of arrears. You know, our conditions are based upon if they're in arrears, we deny. If they work out a payment plan with DSS, you know, we will grant licensure. That's as simple as that.

**MS. LOLIS:**

The Child Support Enforcement Bureau handles these things in a very practical matter. If somebody's \$50 in arrear, they're not going to be contacting the licensing agencies and advising that they're in arrears. It's usually substantial and there's usually attempts to make a payment plan to resolve this. Because, again, practically they don't want people losing licenses and the ability to earn money.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right.

**MS. LOLIS:**

So intelligence is used. It's not just a blanket, you know, *you're \$5 in arrear, we're going to seek to have your license revoked.*

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right. And that's the point I was trying to make, what's the threshold.

**MS. LOLIS:**

I think they decide it on a case-by-case basis. Circumstances -- circumstances may differ with -- you know, with people. Somebody may have gotten sick or whatever, they will look at the circumstances in each case and make that determination if a referral needs to be made to the licensing agencies.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

And from our end -- from the agency's side, it's a, you know, it's a day's long process to -- to get to that determination; not a -- not a lengthy process.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay, okay. All right, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, thank you. Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm not sure who this is a question for. I know -- or maybe I'll start with you, Sammy, that some of the towns are passing similar licensing requirements or registration requirements. Southampton has one, they fingerprint. East Hampton has one and they're now starting to fingerprint. This is for taxis; it might pertain to limousines as well. In reading the law, and I'm assuming we get this jurisdiction to regulate through New York State, and there's some reference to, you know, to counties and population and things like that. Does this supercede the local ability to regulate?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

No, not at all.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And where did the local -- where do the municipalities draw -- because this seems to reference section 498 of New York Vehicle and Traffic Law. And there's a reference to population -- to counties and --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

The only jurisdiction -- we are the only jurisdiction in Suffolk County as Suffolk County that has the ability to create a TLC that will be granted reciprocity with other neighboring counties, such as Nassau County, New York City, Westchester, Rockland. The local municipalities do not have that ability under State code, although they have the ability and the right and there's nothing we can do to supercede that, to use your words, from the County to not allow them.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You may end up with, you know -- similar to what we have with the licensing of plumbers and electricians and carpenters. You may end up having to get the County license in each town that you work in or each village a separate license to operate.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

It's a little different, you know, there's a couple -- there's a couple of distinctions. One: There's a big distinction between the limousine industry and the taxi industry. Primarily the taxis are the regulated business in the towns and villages. Our license -- and our license, the way it was set up by the State, by the State law, is largely for the purposes of interjurisdictional travel. It's much less, you know, that's largely why this was set up, if you read the actual -- the State enabling legislation.

So those that are the licensed, let's say you're in the Village of Lindenhurst, Legislator -- I had this conversation with Legislator McCaffrey's Office this week, they had concerns that -- that there was going to be -- you know, we were going -- imposing something or we were superseding or they were going to lost licensure. It doesn't affect the Village of Lindenhurst to license how they license. The legislation does allow for reciprocity on the registration. And this is something after many conversations on registration of the vehicles, we cannot allow, but they still have to provide the things that are required by 498 to get our license, which is the background checks and the fingerprinting of the owner, that's the vehicle, the registration -- this is the vehicle.

As far as licensure goes, we cannot grant reciprocity to the licensing -- to the licenses of any of the municipalities because we're the only body that is able to issue a license that grants -- that grants intercounty reciprocal travel. So that license, like a Village of Lindenhurst license, and I'm not sure -- I'm not even sure off the top of my head if the Village of Lindenhurst licenses individual drivers or just vehicles, but that wouldn't be recognized in Nassau County. Our license is the only one that would be recognized. So they would have to get -- there essentially -- there'd be a minimal cost to getting a reciprocal license for their vehicle, so they wouldn't have to get all their vehicles, you know, they wouldn't have to pay a large \$250 or \$300 fee, but the drivers would have to get a license through us. We're not -- we're not granting reciprocity of that because we -- the State, you know, because of what the enabling legislation permits us to do, we're not able to.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I understand that. I know there's a problem with the limousines from Suffolk County going through Nassau and getting -- getting fined. But a lot of that is people basically going to the airports, etcetera, by limousine. In my neck of the woods, in my district, and there's certainly limousines that operate out -- all the way out on the East End, but a bigger issue is the taxicabs. And, you know, the fare disparity, you know, people feeling like they're getting ripped off by like exorbitant fees. There are all kinds of other issues with where cabs park and people sleeping in cabs for the night and where cabs are stored. There's all kinds of issues. And so the municipalities are kind of getting into this regulating of taxis. And, first I guess, does anyone have the right to set a fair fare? You know, a reasonable fare like in New York City where they have the meters, can that be done in Suffolk County or by a municipality?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

I'm not familiar if the jurisdiction sets the fare regulation. It's not something that we're exploring right now. I think that would be a much lengthier discussion.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Gail, do you know anything about that? And do you know anything about local authority? And, you know --

**MS. LOLIS:**

Offhand I don't know about the fare, I mean, it's something we could look into.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. And in terms of -- and municipalities can also regulate taxis. Is that something that you concur with, Gail?

**MS. LOLIS:**

The -- you know, the towns and villages, things like that, they could regulate in terms of, you know, the registration. But, again, as Sammy said, not as far as the licensing is concerned.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The registration, but not the license.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

They can license just for their jurisdiction. They can't do anything -- and it has no, there's no mechanism that allows for it to hold any bearing outside of Suffolk County.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. And we're not thinking about any limitations on how many of these licenses or registrations we will allow like, you know, in terms of like a medallion like they might have in New York City where it's a limited number.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

We're newly regulating the space. I expect that, you know, we'll -- we're going to see how things go. I was at the Association -- the Limos Owners Association last night, had a very good discussion with them, answered a lot of concerns, heard a lot of concerns. You know, I expect we're going to have, you know, when we enter a newly regulated space we're going to have a conversation, we're going to find things that, you know, we could be doing better and, you know, I think we could work with the Legislature to find --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One suggestion I'll make is to maybe to reach out to some of those towns that are regulating taxis and see if we can have more of a uniform regulation.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

We had substantial conversation with, you know, with Southampton. Very good conversation. And they actually are interested in working, you know, together with us. And they had one of the more, you know, I should say, you know, busy, you know --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

East Hampton, as well, you may want to reach out to them to because they're trying to put their own taxi regulations. It may help to have a more standardized, you know, set of rules from town to town. Because even operating Southampton to East Hampton, you know, if a taxi company, you know, clearly is going to be taking people between those two municipalities, it'd be nice to have one set of rules.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

We -- you know, as we've done with a lot of other things, we'll gladly work with any jurisdictions. We just also want to be very careful not to send the message that we're looking to, you know -- we're not looking to encroach upon the municipality's jurisdiction. We want to be very clear that we intend on respecting their --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because it seems like most of the focus is on limousines but taxis are an issue. That's really my point.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

This enables, the legislation just -- this legislation will enable, just like it does the limousines, taxicabs to get license for intercounty travel. So it doesn't make a distinction between for hire. So it would enable them the same ability.

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Sammy, it might help -- in Nassau County there's the Town of North Hempstead, the Town Hempstead license the cabs and the limos as well and they -- there's reciprocity between them and the County so it might help to look at how they interact with each other and make -- give some guidance on how we can do it in the future.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Nassau County follows a little bit different process. You know, they're -- and it was a little simpler for them because they had the three, you know, they had a larger jurisdiction to deal with. We had so many and we were so late to the game on this that, you know, there's quite -- there's anything but a homogenous landscape when it comes to regulating this.

So we've been talking to Nassau County. It's a little bit different picture there, but, you know, we look forward to -- this is, you know, kind of the first step. We've been trying very hard. This could have sat on the shelf for another two years. We're trying not -- perfect not to be the enemy of good, so -- and, we are -- our phone lines are open. My, you know, personally I'm willing to have a conversation with any owner/operator that has concerns, questions and has ideas about how to make this better, you know, going forward in the future. But, I think, for the purposes of just getting this industry regulated and serving the needs of the industry and the consumers, I think this is an important first step to meeting -- to meeting with -- the mandate that the Legislature provided to us.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Yes. And, Commissioner, we have had several discussions about this in terms of villages. As you know, I've got some experience in village government.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

I've heard.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I can tell you -- and they -- that's right, you know as well as I do. Right? But they do license the drivers. And I spoke to Babylon, Mayor Scordino there as well, they do the backgrounds checks, the fingerprints for each one of the drivers. So they license the drivers. They also license the cabs as well, provide for inspections of those cabs on a regular basis.

And as I expressed to you before, my concern is that it costs almost \$300 to license each one of those cabs in the villages and for them to obtain those licenses. And I would be concerned that if someone obtained that and went through the process of the fingerprinting and the background check to obtain a license in Lindenhurst or Babylon or any other local municipality that currently regulates taxicabs, that they would have to redo that whole process. So we've had a healthy conversation about this. And I am hoping that we can come to some sort of agreement that if those standards that are being done in those local jurisdictions that are currently licensing them, that they would be able to get the reciprocity to obtain the -- the County license as well. Is that still the direction we're going in?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

For the registration on the vehicles, that's something that's addressed in this and that will be allowed. The individuals for the -- they're very specific. One of the very specific reasons why, you know, besides the fact that our license is the only one that do intercounty travel is the fact that we are, you know, we as an agency have to go through a process with the Department of Criminal Justice Services in New York State to be able to get that background check information. There are

other agencies in the County that have that information, but due to DCJS regulations, that can't be shared information. So just, you know -- and that's information that we'll get notified. And this speaks to a concern that Legislator Hahn had at a previous committee meeting. That means that if someone, you know, does something that they shouldn't be doing, that we would get notification because we are online, our agency's online with the DCJS system. We can't share that between villages. We can't even share that amongst, you know, sister county agencies because that's something that's very regulated, you know, it's confidential information. And it actually has to be, you know, a process that we actually have to go through, you know, as an agency with DCJS.

So, you know, again, we will have as many conversations as they want, as they want to have. This legislation gets passed, nothing changes in the Village of Lindenhurst. We're not doing enforcement in the Village of Lindenhurst for travel in the Village of Lindenhurst, you know, they still get their license. You know, those operators, we're not impacting them and it doesn't supercede them. If they want to travel out of the County and they want to -- if they want to receive reciprocity when they go to Nassau County, they're going to have to -- they're going to have to come to --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. So for reciprocity, say someone currently -- and then let's say Lindenhurst because I'm very familiar with that -- they actually regulate the fares. They tell them this is what you can charge for pickups within the Village of Lindenhurst and -- but only for anyone that's making pickups in the Village of Lindenhurst. And those are the only ones that they can regulate. So if someone else made a pickup in Babylon and went to Lindenhurst, Lindenhurst has no jurisdiction over them and it's vice versa for Babylon as well.

And the fact that they're -- the fees that are being charged for the vehicles and for the licensing of the drivers has a lot to do what the -- ability for the fares to be kept at a reasonable level. So if we now have to charge 300 plus dollars for any additional drivers plus licensing, backgrounds checks and fingerprints and more licensing of the vehicles that are already inspected and licenses at these other municipalities, that would change the whole economic dynamic within -- within those municipalities that now regulate those fares. I mean, we're -- we'd be doubling basically the cost of those licenses.

Now, I understand if they stayed within the Village of Lindenhurst that you have no jurisdiction. But if someone were to make a pickup in Lindenhurst and they say I want to go to, say, to Wyandanch, would that then come underneath the jurisdiction of Suffolk County TLC?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

The vehicle is registered, you know, in our -- the State law primarily enables us the purposes of registration, licenses for intercounty travel. So the license, if they have a -- if they're traveling from Lindenhurst to Wyandanch and they're only traveling and they're not leaving Suffolk County, the answer would be no. If they were traveling outside the County, then the answer would be yes.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay, so if they stay within the County they would not have to get --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Those licenses will be respected. Again, if you -- and I could provide this. I think you probably already have it. If you read the State enabling legislation of what we actually have authority to do, and we've been through this very carefully because we're trying very much to do a good job with this, we largely -- you know, we are granted the ability to grant registration to vehicles for the purposes of intercounty travel. And we are required to license for the purposes of intercounty travel from Suffolk into other Counties. It doesn't give us the ability to supercede licenses here in Suffolk County over other licenses.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Okay. Just so I'm clear then, if they do not require that reciprocity between the Counties, Nassau and Suffolk or New York City, there is no need for them to get a Suffolk County TLC license?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

That's correct. And that's the function -- the function of our license.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay, thank you. Do I have any other questions? Seeing none, I do have a motion, I believe, and a second to table. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1409 is tabled with --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Abstention.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

-- one --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

Abstention.

**(SIDEBAR DISCUSSION)**

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Clerk, please mark Legislator Lindsay as a recusal. **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0-1 - PO GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE - LEG. LINDSAY RECUSED)**

**IR 1425 - Adopting Local Law No. --2014, A Local Law to streamline the functions of certain Occupational Licensing Boards. (Co. Exec.)** I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

On the motion, Legislator Schneiderman.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I just want to -- I understand what this bill is doing, we're basically eliminating the Home Appliance Repair Board and kind of folding it into the Electrical Licensing Board. I just want to make sure we're not changing the criteria for licensing of appliance repair people. It's going to stay the same; right?

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Yes, and the, you know, and the legislation does address that specific industry by requiring that one of the board appointments is a home appliance repair --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We're expanding the board what from like seven to eleven members and adding one person has to be --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Yes, eight to eleven.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

And one has to be a -- one has to be a --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And what typically -- to be a appliance license -- appliance repair person in Suffolk County, what -- what do you have to --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

It's similar to other -- you know, I don't know off the top of my head but it's similar to other -- the other trade license. You have to have certain experience in the trade, you know, and you have to take a test.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is a test we give.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. But it's different than the electrical licensing test.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Very, very much different.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I would imagine so.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

Yeah.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, but none of that's changing.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Just the oversight is moving to the --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

You know, it's just recognizing the fact that there's been a considerable atrophy of the home appliance repair industry.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I didn't know we had a Home Appliance Repair Board.



**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

That's another indication of the atrophy of the industry.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because I don't remember appointing anybody to it so --

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

The fact that we haven't had very many interested parties to appoint is also another indication of the atrophy of the industry.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER CHU:**

You know, people don't generally -- it's not the same industry it once was, you know, people don't -- we're not in a repair culture anymore, we're in a replace culture, so it just reflects that. But it also reflects that they're still -- you know, there's still certain consumers that do fall in the category of procuring home appliance repair services.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Is that -- satisfies your questions, Legislator Schneiderman?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN CALARCO:**

Okay. Any other motions? Any other items? Okay, I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1425 is approved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 7-0-0-0 - PO GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

### ***INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS***

**IR 1487, Introductory Resolutions, (Adopting Local Law No. -2014) A Charter Law to consolidate financial management functions in the County Department of Audit and Control. (Lindsay)** Motion to table by Legislator Lindsay for Public Hearing. I'll second that motion. On the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1487 is tabled. **TABLED (VOTE: 7-0-0-0 - PO GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

I have no other items on the agenda. If nobody else has any items they'd like to bring up, I'll make a motion to adjourn. We are adjourned.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:54 AM  
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**